

MEETING SUMMARY  
**PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, June 8, 2001**

The fortieth meeting of the Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) was held on June 8, 2001, at the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, 1001 I Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Room 230, Sacramento, California.

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Paul E Helliker, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Charles Goodman, California Department of Food and Agriculture  
Mary Louise Flint for Frank Zalom, University of California - Davis, Statewide IPM Program  
Karen Heisler, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9  
Mark Shelton, CA State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo  
Mark Tognazzini, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association  
Robert Bugg, University of California – Davis, SAREP  
Rick Melnicoe, University of California – Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology  
Barry Wilson, University of California - Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology  
Robert Curtis, California League of Food Processors  
Joel Nelson, California Citrus Mutual  
Mel Androus, California Commodity Committee  
William Thomas, Livingston and Mattesich  
Terri Olle, Californians for Pesticide Reform  
Mark Cady, Community Alliance for Family Farmers  
Martha Guzman (UFW) for Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation  
Christine Bruhn, University of California - Davis, Director, Center for Consumer Research  
Cliff Ohmart, Lodi Woodbridge Wine Grape Commission  
Robert Ehn, California Plant Health Association  
Jennifer Ryder Fox, AgraQuest  
Laurie Nelson, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association  
Kim Crum, Calif. Agricultural Production Consultants Association  
Rebecca Sisco (replacing Ron Hampton), Western Region IR-4 Program, UC – Davis  
Matt Billings, Association of Natural Bio-control Producers

**ABSENT MEMBERS (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Cynthia Cory replacing Tess Dennis, California Farm Bureau Federation  
Dawit Zeleke, Nature Conservancy Program for Strategic Pest Management  
Maxwell Norton, UC Cooperative Extension Merced County  
Pete Price, Price Consulting  
Steve Pavich, Pavich Farms  
Robert Baker, Pest Control Operators of California

## **INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group  
Terry Cage, Caliph Aerial Applicators Association  
Gary Van Suple, CDFA  
Claudia Reed, UC – ANR  
Steve Quashuck, CAWG

### DPR Staff (continued):

John Sanders  
David Duncan  
Nan Gorder  
Bob Elliott  
Fred Bundock  
Angelica Welsh  
Sewell Simmons  
Kathy Brunetti  
Bob Hobza  
Thomas Babb

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS AND OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE AND AMENDMENT TO MEETING SUMMARY.**

Paul Helliker opened the meeting, and everyone introduced themselves. Two new members to the PMAC are Ms. Rebecca Sisco, replacing Ron Hampton of the Western Region IR-4 Program and Ms. Cynthia Cory, who will be replacing Tess Denham, California Farm Bureau Federation.

### **2. WINEGRAPE PEST MANAGEMENT ALLIANCE.**

Mr. Joe Browde, California Association of Winegrape Alliance (CAWG), gave a general overview of how the CAWG community is working as a team, some of their key achievements, and other areas CAWG is involved in. Mr. Browde stated that CAWG is relying on DPR for data and support. The bottom line also, is that they need money to finish the projects. There was a general discussion after the presentation, and parts of the discussion follow:

Comment: Buffer protection is a very sensitive area. The question is do we have the data on sulfur deposition as a function of pesticides as opposed to the distance from an application; and if so, can we get the scientific citation so we can know more about it.

Mr. Browde: Some of these ideas often have a life of their own, independent of the data. It's really important to understand how sulfur works, but we don't. Another area has to do with the Spanish language aspect. We really had a good session the Napa Sustainable WineGrowers Group on ecological management of the vineyards, practical ecology in the vineyards. And we did have a session there on sulfur.

Comment: Are you aware of the hard data on sulfur residual? The hard data on sulfur shows that it is a very residual thing, and has residual problems.

Mr. Browde: There are no magic formulas. Everything we've done here are instrumental adjustments to minimize conflicts – to minimize problems with each other.

Comment: A lot of it is involved with something else. It doesn't mean that it's a lack of communication. We just need to enforce some of the basics.

Mr. Browde: I agree with you. It is very much a double-edged sword. You have one person complaining about spraying pesticides and drifting into their yard during the day, and they are also complaining because sprayer dusters are not quiet machinery. But that is one of the things that something can be done about, and has been done by one of the growers. He bought a specific type of sprayer that is much quieter to address the issue with his neighbor. I figure it comes back to the issue of communication. They need to talk to their neighbors.

Comment: What's happening is not surprising. It speaks for all the work that has been done by the local Winegrape groups. They are out front, and what is really encouraging is the response from the Central Valley. But I think that goes back to some growers PMP program about five years ago. A lot of the Winegrape growers are connected. They grow raisins, winegrapes...so I think this attests to the power of the Ag Partnership Model that goes back to this program. Lodi Woodbridge was one of its two programs. It just says how important Ag Partnership program was in reaching out, because now, Joe's got it all together, and is now moving forward to the community.

Comment: Besides things such as sulfur, are we reaching out as broadly as we should. Were there any growers of the 3500 not yet in the program out there who have said that they didn't like the program?

Mr. Browde: From the sulfur component, unless I see any resistance, everybody knows that there's a problem, and it's pretty imminent that if we don't do something, we will lose the material. Most of the fixes are not costly fixes. Things like spending ten minutes to walk over to your neighbor with a bottle of wine and saying, "by the way, I'm sorry to be interrupting, but it's something I have to do." Those kinds of fixes are the easiest.

On the herbicide component – that's where I see the separation starting, and very much a part of that is economics. I sense less resistance in Lodi and Westward. Northwest and Southwest are both areas where economic situations could be better. These growers are struggling. Their economic struggles started last year and a little bit of the year before, but primarily last year. Their economic struggles will continue for, hopefully, not more than a few years, but it's there. We've had comments from a grower that felt we were turning our backs on them. We present them that we do care and we are honest. It's still good people negotiations. That is not to say that we are seeing things happening down there, but there has been a shift. There are a 100+ growers out there, and we would like to get those people to listen to us.

Comment: This is a wonderful program, and I like the idea of true indications to start your presentation to showing incidents where you actually have the potential to show where you will be able to make a difference in the natural reporting. And if you are able to show that, then that's where the money comes in. My other comment is that I'm always fascinated by other people's definition of reduced risk. It seems like the choice is based on the FQPA's...was that the basis of your choice?

Browde: FQPA is one; DPR's and Water Quality. These three are basis for this round, and we've battled that around...including Prop. 69.

Comment: It might make the difference between altered/natural when we really focus in on which things to call reduced risk and non-reduced risk, because then you'll find out that there are various different meanings, some of which get on the FQPA.

Browde: That's a critical component. We need that data, and so far, we are making headway. We need pesticide illness data to be tracked over time, and we also need real PUR data that we can look at and analyze and can be able to see if we are having an effect or not. We are going to have to find a different fact, but you have to realize that it'll take time because it takes a few years to get things right. I would be surprised if it's a substantial change that they want; but things evolve over time. I am waiting for the DPR data. So, DPR people, I really need to get some sulfur drip/drift stuff to me. We can't do our job if we don't have the incident data.

### **3. PROJECT TO EVALUATE DPR'S PEST MANAGEMENT ALLIANCE PROGRAM.**

Mr. Patrick Weddle, Center for Ag Partnerships, presented an overview of the project to evaluate DPR's Pest Management Alliance Program (PMAP). Mr. Weddle began his talk on the desired outcomes of the project to evaluate PMAP.

Mr. Weddle: Clearly, these have been important programs. Those of us who have been closely involved in the program have seen a very different thing, and strategically, this is the time to really take a critical look, an overview look on how these programs have been perfected, and what the outcomes have been. And what they have done, if anything, to improve the program. Assuming that the mill tax is successful, hopefully, in the best of things, we would be able to carry this thing forward to the farming community and target communities where these projects have impacted. I remember when all these things started, it was very exciting. Those of us who were involved in the early years of the projects—we weren't sure how those things were going to happen. We were all excited about the fact that the State government was weighing in to these types of issues, especially those who have struggled within the limitations of pest management. I'm looking forward to being here, to find you some results. We'll be doing this for nine months.

Comment: How are you going to measure it? It's incredibly important to have benchmarks in place and then measurements. Assuming that DPR has a handle on that...the timeline of nine months is good. To whom are you accountable? It's not really important, but we spend an incredible amount of time with PMA, and we were reviewing awards of \$10,000 grants. Bob Elliott informed us that this will be coming up, and I am glad to see that it has. But, as others have said, there's a lot of interest with the committee to see that the money is being used effectively. I don't know how you measure that, and so I'm very much interested on how it will get measured.

Weddle: I can say this, though I don't have specifics on all that yet, and until we get to our advisory committee meetings, that's all that can be said. But one of the things that the Center for Ag Partnerships (Center) has as cornerstones of their projects are: #1) evaluation, #2) evaluation, and #3) evaluation. Part of our evaluation is benchmarks. These are all the things that we can't take for granted in a lot of our projects. Indeed, on some of the earlier projects the Center did, to the extent that they get a quality

problem or benchmark, they could really define the outcomes and results of the project. But if you don't do benchmarks correctly, it's pretty difficult and it becomes anecdotal. So benchmark is a real important component of this, and it's one of the things I am really emphasizing. I want you to know that we are really taking this very seriously.

Comment: I hope you will seek some guidance from folks in management and folks in the payroll who can help identify those things to make sure you get buy-in.

Weddle: Those benchmarks are really important. These are benchmarks that are relevant to the entire industry. The implementation of IPM was a difficult thing to measure. That is one of the reasons why our proposal was such a success with the Department, because of the emphasis that the Center put on evaluation.

Comment: One of the things I hope you take a look at are the non-agricultural situations because they are very different from those you monitor. It's much more of a struggle – I would rather that the PMAP do some guidance on some matters – that they might require different measurable elements.

Paul: We are trying to make sure that the Alliance is informed in other areas besides agricultural stuff (that they might require different measurements.)

Weddle: I understand that we have some folks on our advisory panel who are not agricultural. We also specifically asked people on the outside communities, too, to help us.

Comment: This is going to sound hysterical, but, inherent in every question is the answer. It is terribly important for us to develop our goals and questions so the evaluation is readily apparent and doesn't have to be done with hindsight. Jobs like yours are very, very difficult. I know it sounds like I'm preaching, but it needs something; we need to remember – for every question; there's an answer.

Paul: When I first got involved in this job, one of my very first questions was “how do we measure whether we're successful?” If I could build that into RFPs...for the past two years, we have made comprehensive efforts to look at whether we're meeting those efforts – that is the one of the reasons why we have this taskforce.

Weddle: We looked at and read through a lot of RFPs in the last years. It is interesting to see the difference in RFPs turning out now compared to those five years ago. The difference is the emphasis on evaluation. It used to be that people would give you money to do a project – a big project – in the in the kind of any way you want it. But now, they're looking for evaluation analysis, not just “it feels good, it looks good, everyone likes it, thank you”. They want a systematic and accurate analysis of the results of the expenditures and money they have spent. And they should – they should get it.

Comment: If you didn't have any objectives and clearly stated benchmarks; you would have manipulated outcomes.

Weddle: We will be getting a lot of work done in the next four to five weeks, and when you have your next meeting, we hope to be back then with some meat.

#### **4. SURFACE WATER AND PESTICIDES: Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)/National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits.**

Ms. Valerie Connor, Environmental Specialist from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) presented to the committee an overview on total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). The overview touched on the definition of water quality, water standards and water quality impairment and when it occurs. She explained what the TMDL process is and how it fits in the water standards.

Comment: In looking at the timetable (handout), this plan needs 10 years to complete?

Ms. Connor: An implementation plan is not required by USEPA. Under the water code, when SWRCB adopts something, based on the Regional Boards Water Quality Program, SWRCB adopts the standards. With that standards comes an implementation plan. The implementation plan has performance goals and times table for each final product. But an implementation plan itself, under current rules, is not required by USEPA.

Comment: Do you mean that USEPA can come in and immediately impose a ban on something?

Ms. Connor: No, EPA imposes a numerical standard. EPA can impose a standard, and we measure it. They wouldn't tell you how to read it. EPA doesn't have the authority to regulate salt water and deep-water activities. Unless we find out ourselves, there's a bit of a problem with that situation.

Comment: Let's say that we have a compound that is of concern in California and you propose a TMDL back to EPA. What if another state has a concern over the same compound, and their TMDL is different than the one proposed for California? How does that evolve?

Ms. Connor: Their TMDL problems would be different because what you need to do is, for every receiving waters, you need to look at the beneficial use of that receiving water. Whatever the beneficial use is, and based on that, you will allocate your loads among those discharges to that river or stream. So, the TMDL is very much site specific.

Comment: Is that proposed by the state or dictated by the federal regulations? How?

Ms. Connor: Whatever standard is required at the state, productwise, shouldn't be different between the states.

Comment: Can you get a sense yet of TMDL (toxins) involving everybody...and of course from the Ag scene, a sense of homeowner and holders of pesticides using fertilizers? Is there a big emphasis on this?

Ms. Connor: There are actually farm worker increase listed because of urban pesticide use.

Comment: Does this list (handout) the most critical TMDL that are pesticide related in California?

Ms. Connor: What this is, is right now, the boards were asked to submit to EPA a 15-year schedule for achieving TMDLs for all on the 1998 list. And, the high priority ones are the ones we will be

identifying for the next three years. That table is the summary of all the work that has to do with pesticides.

Comment: In an earlier slide, I noticed that Region 4 has the most pesticides and the most TMDLs. Region 4 is not listed, and I would like to know what Region 4 is, and what is the distinction there that makes it not on the list?

Ms. Connor: Each regional board gets to decide its own priorities. Region 4 is at the number of consensus because there was a large irrigation down there. That's the Los Angeles region. They have a large listing because they have a lot of water bodies. For Region 7, it's mostly an irrigation district and they have very few large water bodies that are listed. They are focusing on things that exercise prioritization.

Comment: I am curious because Region 4 listed such a high number. Some of the really high numbers...what do they consider some of these?

Ms. Connor: Most TMDLs now being done in California are being developed for sedimentation, nutrients, pathogens, and, down in Southern California, they have a whole slough of them...trash, metals, pesticides vs. organic (referencing pollutant types listed in Table). A lot of pesticides have been banned so there is a "wide range" of those that are listed.

Comment: Regarding the 303d listing, could you clarify whether the regional boards are adding or proposing additional compounds to the 303d list. If so, when will that occur? Is that to be submitted, then approved? When will we see those?

Ms. Connor: The schedule (handout) for the new listing – the regional board puts out a solicitation letter and asks for information from anyone. That information was due in May, and the regional boards are now evaluating that data. The 303d list of water bodies that they know the risk was not impractical, so then they will be either adding or deleting water bodies and then push those water bodies they are adding or deleting to reflect those changes. So the regional boards will be putting out a report before the end of August, and people can comment on them until October.

### **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits – Kathy Brunetti, DPR**

Comment: Taking into account the part that is held by the owner of the property, not necessarily the person doing the application, who is responsible for the national pollutant discharge elimination system permits (NPDES)? Is it the owner of the property or the person who ordered the application that will get fined?

Ms. Brunetti: Whoever owns the property or facility will be responsible for the fine. So, if you hire someone to do the spraying or testing, then any fines resulting from that will be your responsibility.

The application is only done directly to the water. If you have hiring someone to spray algae in the river next to your property, under this corpus, you are responsible. If they are spraying the ditch bank that floods into the river, that's a whole different issue. It's probably not a good idea to have it run off into the ditch bank, which in turn would run off into the river. That issue is not covered by this corpus.

## **5. BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT/INTERNET TRANSACTIONS PROJECT.**

Ed Kaempf, NewPoint Group, presented a brief overview of the business process improvement project. Mr. Kaempf stated the purpose of the review, which was to develop recommendations to improve DPR business processes, including moving five selected processes to the Web and providing a virtual service delivery environment. This capability will allow DPR to conduct business transactions via the Internet, and create a support environment for effective online interaction with external stakeholders. The NewPoint Group identified candidates for providing services and information via the Internet. These “E-government” candidates would enable the improved business processes to further enhance the quality, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness of serving DPR stakeholders.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS, AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURN.**

Paul Helliker announced that the next PMAC meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2001, in Training Rooms 1 East and West on First Floor.

Requests for copies of the PMAC meeting summary or reports distributed at the PMAC meeting should be directed to Naomi Fualau at (916) 327-4424, via facsimile at (916) 324-1452 or e-mail at [nfualau@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:nfualau@cdpr.ca.gov) or may be mailed to:

Naomi Fualau  
Executive Office  
Department of Pesticide Regulation  
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015  
Sacramento, California 95812-4015

For information about the PMAC, please contact either:  
Bob Elliott, Pest Management Grants and Alliance (916) 324-4156; or  
Naomi Fualau, for all other issues (916) 327-4424